

June 2, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2813

Actual production of pulp, paper, and paperboard in 1964 rose at least 4 percent over the 1963 figure. With the influx of new industry into Alabama, this increase is expected to be even higher by the end of this year. The added output is also expected to push paper products higher up in the list of items which presently are bringing Alabama its greatest economic growth.

The pulpwood industry planted 14 times as many trees in the decade of the 1950's as in the previous 10 years, and this is now paying off. It is estimated that 1.1 million acres of land has been reforested in Alabama, thus insuring future generations the benefits of this important industry.

Most of the pulpwood produced by this industry is used within the State. It is estimated that 60 percent of Alabama's pulpwood output is consumed at home. The remainder is sent chiefly to States adjacent to Alabama.

BILLION DOLLAR VALUE

A recent U.S. Forest Service report estimated the value of the South's annual timber harvest at more than a billion dollars. This does not include the value added through manufacture.

Total value of Alabama's shipments, figured on a yearly basis, is estimated in excess of \$500 million, and still growing.

Forestry officials estimate that Alabama's 21 million acres of woodland produce 2 billion board feet of timber each year. It is also estimated that two-thirds of Alabama's surface area is woodland.

State forestry officials said that the quality and quantity of Alabama's timber crop is such that the State will double its output of forest products while continuing to increase timber reserves.

For example, over 13,000 workers are employed in the State's pulp and paper mills, with an annual payroll estimated close to \$80 million. Almost 85,000 workers are employed in timberland operations. Harvesting and other operations account for more than 45,000 more workers. Secondary manufacturing and timber construction account for 25,000 more jobs.

One of the promising factors in Alabama's forest growth is that new forest-based industries are coming into being throughout the State. At the same time the existing ones are expanding at a greater pace than ever before.

NEW MILLS BUILT

By the end of 1964, well over \$150 million was invested in Alabama for pulp and paper manufacturing, new paper mills, and plant expansion.

Alabama's production of paper and paperboard has more than doubled over the past 12 years. The State now ranks second in the Nation in pulpwood production.

Forestry officials said that because the bulk of Alabama's pulpwood is either consumed at home or in neighboring States, it is evidence that despite the rapid growth of the industry, paper manufacturing in Alabama still does not utilize the State's current capacity for pulpwood production.

It is estimated by State officials that demand for paper products will double by 1975, and that much of the woodpulp for these products will come from Alabama and the South. They estimate that Alabama and the South will eventually become the main sources of the Nation's total lumber supply.

Rich potential lies in lumber-based enterprises, including furniture manufacturing and a new engineering procedure for manufacturing giant arches and beams of glued laminated lumber and engineered wood components, such as trussed rafters.

Other pine-using industries due for large expansion include naval stores, chemicals, and "forest factories," or lumber companies which make a variety of products from pine logs.

On another forestry front in Alabama, more and more new forest-based industries are coming into being in the State. A new plywood industry based on southern pine began operation last year. As is the case with lumber, plywood utilizes saw-timber trees.

INDUSTRY AUTOMATED

Another big factor in Alabama's forestry growth has been the introduction of many new automated changes in the handling and treating of lumber. These technological advances have made it possible for the home industry to engage in domestic, and in some cases, export markets, which had previously been the sole property of some of the other lumber-producing States, principally in the West.

With the opening of several new inland river ports which not only bring the hinterland of Alabama closer to world markets, but also those at home, the State's woodland industries are getting an additional boost.

These new river ports provide low-cost transportation for the mills to the markets, and this year will bring further prosperity to the woodland industries.

The inland ports will also help to create new markets as well as new outlets for the forest industries. They are also expected to bring new plants, either using or manufacturing forest products, into their regions.

The rebirth of the forestry industry is also expected to stem the flow of agricultural workers into the cities by providing more jobs, and better paying ones. Alabama's forestry payroll is among the highest in the Nation, and growing every year.

By the end of 1965, forestry experts believe that Alabama's woodland industries will have shown the biggest annual increase in the State's history from the standpoint of new mills, new construction, and annual output.

Four-Year Congressional Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during our hearings of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress a great number of constructive recommendations have been made by Members of the House and Senate. Many Members of the House have endorsed the long-delayed proposal to extend the terms of Members of the House from 2 to 4 years.

Over the years, I have received numerous inquiries from my constituents in the First Congressional District of Indiana asking why the House Members must be candidates for reelection every 2 years when almost all of the officials—Federal, State, county, city, and township—have had their terms extended to a period of 4 or more years.

The following editorial by Charles Bartlett in last night's Evening Star brings out some further comments regarding the advisability of Congress taking action on this much-needed change in the terms for Members of the House of Representatives:

IMPROVING THE LOT OF CONGRESSMEN

(By Charles Bartlett)

Three weeks of hearings on congressional reform have surprisingly indicated that it

may be possible to amend the Constitution to accord 4-year terms to Members of the House of Representatives.

This is a widely wished reform that the experts have viewed as beyond reach. Senators have shown little appetite for a change that would enable House Members to compete for Senate seats without sacrificing the seats that they hold. The necessity of this sacrifice under the present system has often restrained the ambitions of Congressmen.

Representative RAY MADDEN, the Indiana Democrat who is cochairman of the joint committee studying congressional reform and an unabashed enthusiast for the 4-year term, conceived a way to win Senate approval one day last winter during a discussion in the cloakroom. He proposes now to require Representatives to resign their seats if they run for the Senate during their 4-year terms.

MADDEN is pressing the 4-year amendment in the long hearings on reorganization and the response to date has encouraged him. The Senators, reassured that they will not be unleashing a pack of competitors, now show some enthusiasm. The biggest remaining barrier may be the reluctance of the House Members to assume the onus of voting to extend their own tenures.

However, samplings of House opinion indicate that at least two-thirds of the Members are eager to put an end to biennial elections. Most observers of congressional life support this aspiration as justified and sensible. All but the most entrenched Members now lead lives that only restless spirits could deem attractive.

Since elections occur every other year and since politicians tend increasingly to believe they do their most effective politicking in the off-years, the House is now like a ship on which most of the crew must work constantly at the pumps. There is little time for sailing on such a ship and few find time for thoughtful legislating in the frenetic atmosphere of the present House.

In the last century, when Congress sat usually for less than half a year, only Members with private means brought their wives to Washington and the rest lodged impatiently in boarding houses. George F. Hoar, of Worcester, wrote in 1890 after 20 years in Congress that he had never managed to afford a house in Washington and that he and his wife had lived a good deal of the time "in a fashion to which no mechanic earning \$2 a day would subject his household."

Some Members still stay in hotels and leave their wives at home, but the length of the sessions has encouraged most Congressmen to establish residence in Washington. There were 314 Members who listed homes or apartments as their addresses in the 1964 social list of Washington.

As the Washington life has improved for Members of the House, the challenge of reelection has become more rugged. The formidable costs of campaigning which run as high as \$50,000 in an urban district, and the prolongation of the campaigns, which now require all the time that can be spared for them, have combined to create a biennial ordeal.

The historical basis for the 2-year terms was a shadowy fear of legislative tyranny in the Constitutional Convention. James Madison anticipated the inconvenience to the Representatives and warned that they would be distracted from their duties by their wariness of rivals. A 3-year term was approved in committee but subsequently shortened by the delegates from seven States who insisted that the people like frequent elections.

The taste of the people for frequent elections has not been affirmed by their low turnout in the off years, when the Presidency is not at stake, or by the fact that only 13 States now restrict their Governors to 2-year terms. The tenure in most local and county offices is being lengthened from

A2814

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 2, 1965

2 to 4 years. These are signs that the people like frequent elections less than they like good government.

The off-years elections are chiefly valuable as weathervanes of public sentiment on national issues. This would not be lost in the amendment proposing that half the House Members be required to run every 2 years. These elections, added to the professional polls, the telephone calls, and the letters, should keep the Government in touch with the voters.

A career in the House is most practical now for men who relish the pursuit of votes and live easily with the pressure groups that finance campaigns. It seems possible that the Nation could be better served by legislators given an opportunity to develop broader capacities and to lead lives similar in some degree to the lives of the people they represent.

Federal Government and Rhode Island Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the unhappy collaboration of the Federal Government and the State of Rhode Island in promoting the physical and financial well-being of the underworld.

I refer to the 17th century morality of the Federal and Rhode Island officials who refuse to decontaminate illegal gambling by controlling it and making gambling revenues work public good rather than mob mischief. It is common knowledge that gambling profits finance every loathsome form of crime and vice known to man. This will be true so long as gambling is both illegal and widespread. The paragons of public virtue who merely sweep gambling under a social carpet of illegality rather than attempt to deal with it constructively are limited partners in every vice they help perpetuate.

Rhode Island, Mr. Speaker, is a hotbed of gambling that would be harmless if it were Government-regulated. But as it is, the Rhode Islander's fun money is the syndicate's gun money. Nor is Rhode Island gambling a smalltime operation. Rhode Island is a small State, but it has more illegal bounce to the ounce than States many times its size.

Last year, the parimutuel betting in Rhode Island came to \$106 million. The real loot, however, turns on illegal gambling. Testimony before the McClellan committee pegged national off-track gambling at \$50 billion annually. Other testimony indicated that off-track betting accounts for only some 42 percent of illegal gambling. This would put yearly illegal gambling in the United States at \$120 billion or thereabouts. On a population basis, Rhode Island would have about \$600 million of this total. The crime rings get to keep about 10 percent of this money as profit.

By keeping gambling illegal, the unholy partnership of the Federal and State

Governments makes all this possible. So long as gambling is illegal, it will work against, and not for, the people. The governments that team up to keep gambling under the rug and out of the sunlight are fullfledged partners in the dirt that ensues.

I ask the Members of Congress to look at the relationship between crime and gambling, and to ignore the bleats of the wounded lobbyists of the syndicate-bluenose alliance who hate the truth. We need a national lottery in America to make the ineradicable gambling instinct work for the national good and not the national detriment.

DR

President Johnson Makes the Right Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in the Dominican Republic have shown to the American people that we intend to protect freedom not only where free people are threatened at distances throughout the world, but particularly when there is a threat in our own backyard.

I have applauded the President's actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic on prior occasions because I felt he had taken the proper steps at the proper time. All Americans are grateful for this strong and speedy action to preserve freedom around the world.

An editorial in the May 27, 1965, Jacksonville, Fla., Journal, written by Rex Edmondson, praises President Johnson's decision to move troops into the Dominican Republic when our citizens in that country were threatened, and when there was fear of a Communist takeover. I commend the editorial to the House and to the country.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, May 27, 1965]

THE RIGHT MOVE

Some semblance of normality appears to have returned to the Dominican Republic, but it will be a long and frustrating period of adjustment if those people are to establish a government that can live within the framework of the Latin American nations.

With the crisis sputtering to an end, at least as far as the shooting is concerned, President Johnson still has the problem of when to withdraw American troops, amid the clamor of second guessing that he acted wrong in sending them there in the first place.

The question persists, was there really any danger of a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic? The New York Times observed that since U.S. troops had intervened, "no one any longer will be able to prove or disprove the thesis that a rebel victory would have brought a Communist government to Santo Domingo."

Still others decry the great diplomatic damage done the good-neighbor policy and concept of inter-American cooperation and equality.

The truth is that the Dominican revolution would have long been over before the Organization of American States could have

decided on the need for action and then taken such action, had the United States sat back and waited upon its advice and consent.

Maybe these critics would have felt better had President Johnson waited to make sure the Commies were, in fact, the threat. That is, until the new government had signed a trade agreement with the Soviet Union and Russian technicians had begun arriving.

Then perhaps the new Dominican government could have been palsy with Cuba and this Nation would know for sure.

It's fortunate that the United States did not feel as indecisive this time.

The Dominican question should still be debated in the councils of the OAS, but it is because of our quick action that there is anything left to debate.

What Ethics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the article "The Johnsons and the FCC" in the Washington Star of June 1, 1965.

The facts relative to the television holdings of the Johnson family and the decisions pending before the Federal Communications Commission that may influence the future value of those holdings are important for examination by Congress and the public.

The picture of the Johnson administration's FCC struggling with decisions involving the Johnson family's television interests demonstrates that the ethics code signed by L.B.J. is a sham. It also dramatizes that the so-called trust that is now alleged to control the Johnson television interests is a farce when it comes to actual applications.

Even the cute Abe Fortas manipulation of changing the name from "The L.B.J. Co." to "Texas Broadcasting" has not fooled anyone and least of all the members of the FCC. They know that the largest stockholder listed as "Claudia T. Johnson" is none other than Mrs. Johnson, wife of the President. They know that it is the President who will make the decisions on whether they are reappointed or dropped from the FCC.

This whole setup makes a mockery of the Johnson code of ethics which warns all executive branch officials to "avoid any actions which might result in, or create the appearance of giving preferential treatment to any organization or person."

All indications are that business is booming for the Johnson television interests. News stories and magazine articles indicate it is booming as much as business at the Abe Fortas law firm and at Bobby Baker's Serv-U Vending Co.

The article follows:

THE JOHNSONS AND THE FCC

(By Walter Pincus)

The license renewal applications of the Texas Broadcasting Corp. illustrates how deeply the Johnson-owned radio and television stations are involved in controversial

June 2, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

11923

their children through college. In addition, of course, the youngster can be asked to assume some form of long-term debt.

I favor the tax credit approach because it permits the parent the privilege of choosing either a State supported institution or a private institution.

This in turn will mean that taxpayers in general will not have to pay the millions of dollars needed to build or expand State universities and colleges while underutilizing private college facilities.

There are numerous other benefits I'm sure—but this short note gives one aspect of the benefits of the tax credit approach.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD S. GORDON,
Associate Dean.

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
Delaware, Ohio, May 20, 1965.

The Honorable ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on
Education, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: In response to your letter of May 17, I would like to state that I do favor a concept of tax credits for higher education.

Although I may not be familiar with all of the implications, I do feel that this assistance would give a substantial relief to parents who are forced to pay the currently high costs of higher education and that it would encourage contributions from others to support the higher education.

It seems to me that this might be an effective way to give Federal support to education without invoking the dangers of control or imperiling the basic concept of the separation of church and state.

Sincerely yours,

ELDEN T. SMITH,
President.

MOUNT ALOYSIUS JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Cresson, Pa., May 20, 1965.

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on
Education, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: Thank you for your notice pertaining to the proposed legislation concerning aid to offset the increasing cost of higher education via the tax credit approach.

I am indeed in favor of such an arrangement and hope that it will become available soon. Such legislation is highly appropriate in this area which lies in a low economic stratum.

With every good wish for the success of the work there, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Sister MARY DE SALES, R.S.M.

KENYON COLLEGE,
Gambier, Ohio, May 20, 1965.

The Honorable ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: Yes, you may certainly list me as a long-time supporter favoring tax credits for the expense of attending colleges. I shall not attempt to "brief" the case here; but I am convinced first, that tax credits represent the most effective equalization of support as between publicly supported institutions and private colleges; second, that each and every so called "private" institution serves the public no less vitally than a "public" institution; and last, that we have a vital and compelling need to preserve a balance between both private and public universities and colleges. Toward this end, I see no more fundamental approach than that of tax credit.

I wish that I could attend the hearing on May 24; but the short notice prevents this.

Sincerely,

F. EDWARD LUND.

NEW YORK, N.Y., May 21, 1965.

Mr. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force
on Education, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: Absence from the city has prevented me from making a more prompt reply to your inquiry of May 17 asking for my views on possible legislation authorizing tax credits for higher education. I trust that this reply will reach you in time to be of some use in your prospective hearings on May 24.

May I first attest to my interest in the promotion of higher education. I am a trustee and a member of the finance committee of a small independent college, and a member of advisory councils to three major universities. I am a former college teacher. For the last 25 years, I have also been an avid recruiter of the products of our colleges—first for Federal Government service, and later for business. I am, therefore, extremely interested that the products of our colleges and universities shall be of high quality and that no one has a capacity and interest to become a highly qualified college graduate should be denied the opportunity by reason of his economic circumstances.

At the same time, I do entertain very great reservations about such proposals as have come to my attention for adding a tax credit to our income tax laws. There may be many variations, but the one with which I am most familiar is the so-called Ribicoff tax credit bill. I am opposed to the principles embodied in that bill for three principle reasons:

1. It would be unwise tax policy to enact any such credit.
2. In the proposed form it would be unfair and unacceptable in any event since it in effect would steepen the tax progression through diminution (even complete elimination) of the credit because of income size.
3. It would give little relief to those unable financially to provide college training.

Very truly yours,

LEROY D. STINEBOWER.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Columbus, Ohio, May 19, 1965.

The Honorable ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on
Education, U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: In responding to your letter of May 17, 1965, let me say that almost all of us in higher education would agree with your conviction that individuals ought to be able to obtain advanced education without excessive financial sacrifice. Additionally, I believe you would get strong consensus in support of your position to the effect that such a goal should be attained without in any way weakening our excellent system of higher education. Suggested ways to accomplish this end have been introduced from time to time in testimony provided by representatives of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Briefly stated, my own personal point of view can be summarized about as follows: I believe there is considerable public misunderstanding of the tax credit approach. With anything more than a cursory study of the tax credit plan one sees rather easily, I think, that this bill will provide almost no help for those who need it most. Let me illustrate:

A taxi driver who is attempting desperately to provide his four children with educational advantages that he was never able to enjoy would find no relief in this measure. Simple arithmetic reveals that with his large family he pays little or no Federal taxes and, therefore, cannot benefit from a tax credit. On the other hand a family with an income

of \$35,000 annually could receive up to about \$225 in tax credit, but such a family is in that group that needs the least help.

There is an equally dangerous but more subtle aspect of the tax credit proposal. Proponents of the bill, as I understand it, have inferred that institutions also will benefit through opportunities to raise tuitions. If this action does occur, and it no doubt will if the bill is passed, the tax credit plan would fail not only to aid students from low-income families, it would actually add to their burdens in seeking higher education. If my conclusion is correct, then the enactment of a tax credit plan would not be in harmony with the goal you set forth in your letter of May 17, 1965.

For your benefit I am attaching a brochure that has been prepared by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. From my personal point of view this brochure sets forth in succinct language what I believe to be the essence of the tax credit route.

Finally, I doubt seriously if an investment of \$1½ billion annually in aid to higher education can produce the best results through a tax credit approach.

I have every confidence that our Congress, in its deliberations as to the best methods to assist higher education, will find a way to broaden opportunities for able young people to go to college, rather than merely settling on a plan that will provide subsidy to those already fortunate enough to attend college without such assistance.

I appreciate very much receiving your letter of May 17 and, while my views that have been set forth above may not square with the kinds of information you are seeking, I know you would want me to express my personal convictions, my professional commitments, and my honest opinion on a matter as critical as this one is.

Very sincerely yours,

NOVICE G. FAWCETT,
President, the Ohio State University.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to commend the gentleman from New York on the good work he is doing on the Republican task force on education. I am very pleased that you would take the time from your duties to serve on this subcommittee. I have seen not only the tremendous interest but the insight you have on educational problems. It has been a great help to us to have you working on these problems in the field of education and working toward a solution in an effort to meet the problems that confront us throughout the country. Not only those of us on the Republican side, but all of the Members of Congress and the country at large can be happy that the gentleman from New York is working with us in this effort to try to solve these problems.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, although I cannot say that I agree with all the philosophical implications of the statement which the gentleman from New York has made, nevertheless I do want to say a word of welcome to him as he completes his maiden speech to the House.

The gentleman and I were classmates at Dartmouth as members of the class of 1933 and we have maintained a friendship over the years since our graduation.

11924

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 2, 1965

We also had one other experience in common. We both at different times for a goodly span of years held the post of secretary of our college class.

I therefore welcome him as an old friend and hope that he will find happiness and satisfaction in his service in the House of Representatives.

SOME ANSWERS TO SECOND-GUESSERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of June 1 carried a column by Eric Sevareid which comes as a fresh breeze of reality and truth at a time when there is much confusion, misunderstanding, and lack of clear thinking with regard to President Johnson's policy in the crisis of the Dominican Republic.

The title of that column is "Some Answers to Second-Guessers." Mr. Sevareid points out that second guessing on any issue is one thing, but having the responsibility to act in a crisis is still another thing. I commend a reading of this column to those who believe it is time that we discard self-conscious ideas about what others think of the United States and concentrate on ideas and actions required to preserve democratic government. By leave obtained, I include the column on "Some Answers to Second-Guessers":

SOME ANSWERS TO SECOND-GUESSERS
(By Eric Sevareid)

SANTO DOMINGO.—The tide of second guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after five centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its soiled streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disastrous lack of contact between reports and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable Government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful blood-letting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor and a safety sector with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste.

Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of too late with too little. I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of too soon with too much. I fail to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present.

In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that President Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that they could act with rapidity when the explosion came. It was because they were few that foreign opinionmakers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As John Farrow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

Partly because of this—their small numbers—American troops could not invade the heart of the city, or allow anyone else to invade it.

You cannot risk causing many deaths in order to capture a few individuals and expect, ever, to justify such an action to anybody, certainly not to the American people. So, at this writing at least, the Dominican Communists remain, finding safety as they first find strength, in their numbers—their small numbers.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments. This is why Castro laughs in his beard. He believes the political metamorphosis of Latin America is not manageable on our terms.

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists on their own. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

Meantime the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's troubles are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

HELP AMERICA BY HELPING AMERICANS GET A BETTER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it has been for me a real privilege to serve as a member of the House Republican task force on education.

I have long been interested in education, and year after year, I have studied various plans and programs that have been presented to the Congress, so that more and more I have come to the conclusion that if we really want a Great Society and to banish crime and poverty, there is really only one long-range solution to cure these domestic problems of our time, and that is education.

However, it has seemed that most legislation proposed has been directed toward improved facilities and the needs of education itself, and less or too little toward helping worthy students and parents so an education is possible. By this I mean that outside of loans and grants to students, it has seemed to me that too little consideration has been given, in the face of ever-increasing tuition and fees of institutions of higher learning, to the individual who should go to college. Certainly, it is in the national interest to assist the student taxpayers and their parents in meeting these increasing costs so that working students and their parents are able to afford the education.

Speaking of increasing costs, Mr. Speaker, in my own State of Washington, for example, it is conceded by educational organizations that—thanks to a new Governor—our State legislature earlier this year provided what was considered to be reasonably adequate appropriations for public education, including a provision for needed increases in teachers' salaries. However, the board of regents of the University of Washington, in the face of greatly expanded need, has been forced to raise yearly tuition from \$300 to \$345 and it is expected that Washington State University will follow suit. This is the same pattern of other similar institutions, and I understand that a sampling of 50 well-known private colleges and universities, due to ever-escalating costs, indicates an average increase in tuition from \$250 per year in 1930 to \$1,200 a year as of 1964.

Furthermore, as Representative ALBERT QUIE, chairman of the House Republican task force, recently pointed out, it is estimated that tuition will rise by another 50 percent in both private and public educational institutions over the next 10 years.

In this connection, certainly Congress has an obligation, in the interest of the general welfare, to keep the doors of learning open and available to qualified students of low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard many friends and older persons of my generation say that they worked their way